



LAWRENCE  
LIVERMORE  
NATIONAL  
LABORATORY

# Bounds on Elastic Constants for Random Polycrystals of Laminates

James G. Berryman

May 10, 2004

Journal of Applied Physics -- This paper is about to be  
published in October, 2004.

## **Disclaimer**

---

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

# Bounds on Elastic Constants for Random Polycrystals of Laminates

James G. Berryman\*

*University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,  
P.O.Box 808 L-200, Livermore, CA 94551-9900, USA*

(Dated: May 10, 2004)

A well-known result due to Hill provides an exact expression for the bulk modulus of any multicomponent elastic composite whenever the constituents are isotropic and the shear modulus is uniform throughout. Although no precise analog of Hill's result is available for the opposite case of uniform bulk modulus and varying shear modulus, it is shown here that some similar statements can be made for shear behavior of random polycrystals composed of laminates of isotropic materials. In particular, the Hashin-Shtrikman-type bounds of Peselnick, Meister, and Watt for random polycrystals composed of hexagonal (transversely isotropic) grains are applied to the problem of polycrystals of laminates. An exact product formula relating the Reuss estimate of bulk modulus and an effective shear modulus (of laminated grains composing the system) to products of the eigenvalues for quasi-compressional and quasi-uniaxial shear eigenvectors also plays an important role in the analysis of the overall shear behavior of the random polycrystal. When the bulk modulus is uniform in such a system, the equations are shown to reduce to a simple form that depends prominently on the uniaxial shear eigenvalue — as expected from physical arguments concerning the importance of uniaxial shear in these systems. One application of the analytical results presented here is for benchmarking numerical procedures used for estimating elastic behavior of complex composites.

PACS numbers: 46.65.+g, 46.25.Ce, 46.25.-y

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the course of analyzing a problem on fluid-dependence of shear modulus in poroelastic systems, the author [1] uncovered an unanticipated identity in elasticity that appears to have wider implications for many elastic systems and/or composites. The basic result states that for *any* hexagonal (or transversely isotropic) elastic system there is an exact product formula, namely,  $6K_R G_{\text{eff}}^V = \omega_+ \omega_-$ , relating the Reuss estimate  $K_R$  of the bulk modulus times the Voigt estimate  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  of the uniaxial part of the shear modulus to the product of the two system eigenvalues  $\omega_{\pm}$  for quasi-compressional and quasi-shear modes. There is also a second product formula with the roles of the Reuss and Voigt averages reversed, but this second identity is somewhat less important as we shall see.

Our goal here will be to show how these facts help to remove in part (although only in one special, but nevertheless interesting, case) the asymmetry in the analysis of elastic composites resulting from the existence of Hill's well-known formula [2–4] for arbitrary elastic composites,

showing that

$$K^* = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{K_n + 4\mu/3} \right]^{-1} - 4\mu/3. \quad (1)$$

Here the bulk modulus of the  $n$ -th constituent is  $K_n$ , the shear modulus takes the same value  $\mu_n = \mu$  for all  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , and the overall effective bulk modulus is  $K^*$ . The volume fractions  $f_n$  are all nonnegative, and add up to unity. In general there is in fact no corresponding relationship for the overall shear modulus  $\mu^*$ , when instead the system has constant bulk modulus  $K_n = K$  for all  $N$  constituents. But, nevertheless, the existence of formulas quite analogous to (1) for shear will be demonstrated for a model random polycrystal composed of laminated grains.

As always in the theory of composites, there are several clear limitations to the use of the analysis in practice: (a) the continuum hypothesis, (b) the implicit assumption of adequate separation of scales between sizes of grains and of the overall composite, and (c) an assumption of negligible porosity. The continuum hypothesis will clearly be violated if the grain sizes are too small, approaching nanometer sizes and below. The deviations expected in our case are similar to those observed in deviations from the Hall-Petch effect [5–7], *i.e.*, a softening of the composite as a function of decreasing grain size once the size is below some threshold. This effect is caused in part

---

\*berryman1@llnl.gov

by a significant increase in grain-to-grain interface area (which is not accounted for by the present theory) in composites when the grains become too small. At still smaller grain sizes, atomic scale effects become important and the continuum theory must clearly fail. At the other extreme, if the grains are too large, then there may not be sufficient numbers of particles in the sample for the separation of scales between composite and grains to be adequate. This issue is related to the question of what is an adequate REV (representative elementary volume) [8–10]. If the grains are too large and, therefore, too few, the entire sample may not be large enough to serve as an adequate REV. Finally, when a polycrystal is constructed by assembling many crystalline grains, it is also important that very little porosity remain in the resulting polycrystal. It has been estimated [11] that as little as 0.5% porosity in a composite is sufficient to make it important to include the porosity in the model. But, except to exclude it thus from consideration, porosity is not discussed here.

Section II introduces the notation and basic results used in the rest of the paper. Section III considers the case of constant bulk modulus, and shows that the Voigt and Reuss averages for shear modulus, although differing in their numerical values, nevertheless depend on simple averages of the shear modulus plus another average comparable to (1). Section IV considers the general problem for bounds on the moduli of random polycrystals of laminates, with special emphasis on the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds [12, 13] for polycrystals. The discussion of Section V summarizes some practical conclusions about the analysis and also makes a comparison with a “self-consistent” estimate related to the bounds. Two technical Appendices summarize results used in the main text.

## II. ELASTICITY OF LAYERED MATERIALS

We assume that a typical building block of the random system is a small grain of laminate material whose elastic response for such a transversely isotropic (hexagonal) system can be described by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & & & \\ c_{12} & c_{11} & c_{13} & & & \\ c_{13} & c_{13} & c_{33} & & & \\ & & & 2c_{44} & & \\ & & & & 2c_{44} & \\ & & & & & 2c_{66} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{33} \\ e_{23} \\ e_{31} \\ e_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\sigma_{ij}$  are the usual stress components for  $i, j = 1 - 3$  in Cartesian coordinates, with 3 (or  $z$ ) being the axis of symmetry (the lamination direction for such a layered material). Displacement  $u_i$  is then related to strain component  $e_{ij}$  by  $e_{ij} = (\partial u_i / \partial x_j + \partial u_j / \partial x_i) / 2$ . This choice of definition introduces some convenient factors of two into the 44, 55, 66 components of the stiffness matrix shown in (2).

Although some of the results presented here are more general, we will assume for definiteness that this stiffness matrix in (2) arises from the lamination of  $N$  isotropic constituents having bulk and shear moduli  $K_n, \mu_n$ , in the  $N > 1$  layers present in each building block. It is important that the thicknesses  $d_n$  always be in the same proportion in each of these laminated blocks, so that  $f_n = d_n / \sum_n d_n$ . But it is not important what order the layers were added to the blocks, as Backus’s formulas [14] for the constants show. For the overall behavior for the quasistatic (long wavelength) behavior of the system we are studying, Backus’s results (also see [4, 15]) state that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{33} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle^{-1}, & c_{13} &= c_{33} \left\langle \frac{K-2\mu/3}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle, \\ c_{44} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-1}, & c_{66} &= \langle \mu \rangle, \\ c_{11} &= \frac{c_{13}^2}{c_{33}} + 4c_{66} - 4 \left\langle \frac{\mu^2}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle, & c_{12} &= c_{11} - 2c_{66}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

This bracket notation can be correctly viewed: (a) as a volume average, (b) as a line integral along the symmetry axis  $x_3$ , or (c) as a weighted summation  $\langle Q \rangle = \sum_n f_n Q_n$  over any relevant physical quantity  $Q$  taking a constant value  $Q_n$  in the  $n$ -th layer.

The bulk modulus for each such building block (or crystalline grain if you like) is that given by the compressional Reuss average  $K_R$  of the corresponding compliance matrix  $s_{ij}$  [the inverse of the usual stiffness matrix  $c_{ij}$ , whose nonzero components are shown in (2)]. The well-known result is  $e = e_{11} + e_{22} + e_{33} = \sigma / K_{\text{eff}}$ , where  $1/K_{\text{eff}} = 1/K_R = 2s_{11} + 2s_{12} + 4s_{13} + s_{33}$ . This quantity can be expressed in terms of the stiffness elements as

$$\frac{1}{K_R - c_{13}} = \frac{1}{c_{11} - c_{66} - c_{13}} + \frac{1}{c_{33} - c_{13}}. \quad (4)$$

When  $\mu_n = \text{const}$ , it is easy to show that (4) implies (1).

Even though  $K_{\text{eff}}$  is the same for every grain, since the grains themselves are not isotropic, the overall bulk modulus  $K^*$  of the random polycrystal is not necessarily the same as  $K_{\text{eff}}$  for the individual grains [16]. Hashin-Shtrikman bounds on  $K^*$  for random polycrystals whose grains have hexagonal symmetry [12, 13] show in fact that the value  $K_R$  lies outside the bounds in many situations. We will say more about this in Section IV.

In general an upper bound on the overall shear modulus of an isotropic polycrystal [16] is given by the Voigt average over shear of the stiffness matrix, which may be written as

$$\mu_V = \frac{1}{5} (G_{\text{eff}}^V + 2c_{44} + 2c_{66}). \quad (5)$$

This expression can be taken as the definition of  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$ . Eq. (5) implies that  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = (c_{11} + c_{33} - 2c_{13} - c_{66})/3$ .  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  is the energy per unit volume in a grain when a pure uniaxial shear strain of unit magnitude is applied to the grain along its axis of symmetry [1].

### III. CONSTANT BULK MODULUS

As a first result, consider a laminated grain composed of isotropic constituents, all having the same bulk modulus  $K$  in each layer, but differing shear moduli. Then, if we define the function [compare (1)]

$$g(\zeta) = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{\mu_n + \zeta} \right]^{-1} - \zeta, \quad (6)$$

we find from (3) that  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = g(\zeta)$  with  $\zeta = 3K/4$ . This function  $g(\zeta)$  has the interesting and useful properties that

$$c_{44} = \langle 1/\mu \rangle^{-1} \equiv g_- \leq g(\zeta) \leq g_+ \equiv \langle \mu \rangle = c_{66}. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore,  $g(\zeta)$  is a monotonic function, achieving its lower bound when  $\zeta = 0$  and approaching its upper bound as  $\zeta \rightarrow \infty$ . This formula shows in an elementary way how  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = g(3K/4)$  — and therefore  $\mu_V$  — depends on the constant bulk modulus of the system, and that this component of the Voigt bound on the overall shear modulus increases with increasing magnitude of the bulk modulus. The overall Voigt bound/estimate (5) for shear therefore has very similar behavior, but the magnitude of the effect is reduced by a factor of 5, since this is only one of the five distinct contributors to the overall shear behavior of the system. So the largest change in the Voigt shear modulus that variations in bulk modulus can ever induce are expected to be on the order of 20% (or less) of the difference  $c_{66} - c_{44}$ .

Similarly, the Reuss average for shear is

$$\mu_R = \left[ \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}^R} + \frac{2}{c_{44}} + \frac{2}{c_{66}} \right) \right]^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

which is also a rigorous lower bound on the overall shear modulus of the polycrystal [16]. For each hexagonal grain, the product formulas  $3K_R G_{\text{eff}}^V = 3K_V G_{\text{eff}}^R = \omega_+ \omega_- / 2 = c_{33}(c_{11} - c_{66}) - c_{13}^2$  are valid. The symbols  $\omega_{\pm}$  stand for the quasi-compressional and quasi-uniaxial shear eigenvalues for all the grains [1]. The product formulas show immediately that  $G_{\text{eff}}^R = G_{\text{eff}}^V K_R / K_V = G_{\text{eff}}^V$ , since  $K_R = K_V = K$ . Thus, for this relatively simple system, pure compression ( $e_{11} = e_{22} = e_{33}$ ) is an eigenvector corresponding to stiffness eigenvalue  $3K$ . Uniaxial shear strain ( $e_{33} = -2e_{11} = -2e_{22}$ ) is also an eigenvector and  $2G_{\text{eff}}^V = 2G_{\text{eff}}^R$  is the corresponding eigenvalue.

### IV. RANDOM POLYCRYSTALS OF LAMINATES

Returning to the general problem for arbitrary  $K_n$ , suppose we construct a random polycrystal by packing small bits of this laminate material into a large container in a way so that the axis of symmetry appears randomly over all possible orientations and also such that no empty




FIG. 1: Various bulk modulus bounds: The outer most bounds (blue dot-dash lines) are the standard Hashin-Shtrikman bounds (HS) based only on information about the layer constituents and their volume fractions. The black solid lines are the Voigt and Reuss bounds (XV, XR) obtained from appropriate averages of laminate constants in (3). The inner most bounds (also blue dot-dash lines) are the Peselnick-Meister bounds (PM) for hexagonal polycrystals. For contrast, the Dederich-Zeller bounds (DZ) (see Appendix B) are also shown (dashed red lines).

volume (porosity) is left in the resulting composite. If the ratio of grain size to overall composite is small enough so the usual implicit assumption of scale separation applies to the composite — but not so small that we are violating the continuum hypothesis — then we have an example of the type of material we want to study.

For each individual grain in this polycrystal, Eqs. (3) are valid locally (*i.e.*, for locally defined coordinates), and the grain bulk modulus  $K_R$  is given by (4) for all the grains. The factors  $3K_R$  and  $2G_{\text{eff}}^V$  are not necessarily eigenvalues of elastic stiffness for individual grains. The Voigt average for shear is again given by (5), which is an upper bound on the isotropic shear modulus of the random polycrystal [16].

The advantage of studying polycrystals of laminates is that we have available an array of theoretical results from which to choose. For example, since each grain is composed of isotropic constituents, standard Voigt and Reuss bounds [16], as well as the more restrictive Hashin-Shtrikman bounds [17, 18] on composites made up of isotropic constituents are available. Then, we can instead, or in addition, consider Voigt and Reuss bounds on the laminated grain materials. Formulas for these bounds have already been given here for in Eqs. (4), (5), and (8), respectively for  $K_R$ ,  $\mu_V$ , and  $\mu_R$ . The remaining formula is well-known to be

$$K_V = [2(c_{11} + c_{12}) + 4c_{13} + c_{33}] / 9. \quad (9)$$

Then, it is useful to distinguish between “correlated” and “uncorrelated” bounds. For example, the most familiar bounds — after the uncorrelated Voigt and Reuss bounds






FIG. 4: As in Figure 3 for the case of constant bulk modulus, in which case  $K_V = K_R = K$ , and  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = G_{\text{eff}}^R$ . Values of the constants entering the expressions (see Appendix A) are:  $K = 50.0000$ ,  $c_{44} = 7.2727$ ,  $c_{66} = 22.0000$ ,  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = 16.5546$ , in units of GPa.

that produce the optimum bounds. It is clear that the value of  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  plays a very dominant role in the structure of this Figure as the singularity in the blue solid curve occurs exactly at this value.

For the case of constant bulk modulus  $K_n = K$ , Figure 3 should be contrasted with Figure 4. Obviously, the structure is much simpler, as the singularities in (22) and (24) have disappeared through direct cancelation with the numerator. It is still the case however that the allowed regions in Figure 4 are the bounded areas in upper right-hand corner, and the lower left-hand corner. Again the red circles are the points in the  $(G_{\pm}, K_{\pm})$ -plane that produce the optimum bounds. However, it is no longer clear from this Figure whether  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  is playing any role in the analysis or not.

While attempting to find an answer to this question, the author has spent some effort manipulating the form of the equations for the shear modulus bounds and has found what may be a more enlightening form of these equations. (The derivation will not be given here as it is rather straightforward to find the result again, once the final expression is known.) The resulting simplified formula for the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds on overall shear modulus of a polycrystal of laminates when  $K_n = K$  is:

$$\mu_{PM}^{\pm} = \left[ \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}^V + \zeta_{\pm}} + \frac{2}{c_{44} + \zeta_{\pm}} + \frac{2}{c_{66} + \zeta_{\pm}} \right) \right]^{-1} - \zeta_{\pm}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\zeta_{\pm} = \frac{G_{\pm}}{6} \left( \frac{9K + 8G_{\pm}}{K + 2G_{\pm}} \right) \quad \text{with } G_{\pm} = c_{44} \text{ or } c_{66}. \quad (14)$$

Using standard methods, it is not hard to show that, if instead of optimum values of  $\zeta_{\pm}$ , we use  $\zeta_{\pm} = 0$  or  $\infty$ , then (13) reduces to the formulas (8) and (5) for the

correlated Reuss and Voigt bounds on the polycrystal's overall shear modulus.

We see that  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  still plays a dominant role here — in the company of  $c_{44}$  and  $c_{66}$  — as one of the three values (after multiplication by 2) that are the shear eigenvalues of the elastic system. Furthermore,  $G_{\text{eff}}^V$  is determined for this case exactly by Eq. (6).

## V. DISCUSSION

The results thus obtained show that, for the shear modulus  $G_{\text{eff}}$  of uniaxial shear for a transversely isotropic system, we have  $2G_{\text{eff}}^V = \omega_+$  when the bulk modulus of the system is uniform. In this case, the quasi-shear eigenvector is exactly in the same direction as the uniaxial shear component, so the quantity  $2G_{\text{eff}}^V$  — while more generally a strict upper bound on the eigenvalue  $\omega_+$  — is exactly equal to it in this special case. Thus, the uniaxial shear is in fact an eigenvector of this system. This happens in particular when  $K_n = K$  is a constant for random polycrystals of laminates. The simplified formula (13) for the bounds is therefore the main new result of this paper. When compared to (8), it is suggestive that some very simple forms for Hashin-Shtrikman bounds on shear can probably be found for many such polycrystalline systems, and especially so for granular laminates. The constant bulk modulus limit is a most convenient place to begin a search for such simplified expressions for the bounds.

Once these HS bounds are known, it is an elementary operational exercise to determine self-consistent (SC) estimates based just on the analytical form of the bounds. Monotonicity of the functional

$$M(\zeta) = \left[ \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}^V + \zeta} + \frac{2}{c_{44} + \zeta} + \frac{2}{c_{66} + \zeta} \right) \right]^{-1} - \zeta, \quad (15)$$

appearing in (13), is easy to prove (see [21] for examples of such proofs), and furthermore  $\zeta(K, G) = (G/6)(9K + 8G)/(K + 2G)$  is a monotonic functional of both arguments. These facts guarantee that there is a unique solution to the self-consistency relation

$$\mu_{SC} \equiv M(\zeta(K, \mu_{SC})), \quad (16)$$

and furthermore that this solution always lies between the bounds. To provide an example, consider the case of Figure 4 when the volume fractions are both 50%. Then,  $\mu_{44} = 7.2727$ ,  $\mu_{66} = 22.0000$ ,  $G_{\text{eff}} = 16.5546$ ,  $\mu_{PM-} = 13.1164$ ,  $\mu_{PM+} = 13.8659$ , and  $\mu_{SC} = 13.5537$ . So the self-consistent estimate is not closely correlated with the value of  $G_{\text{eff}}$ , which is itself usually found outside the correlated bounds on  $\mu$ . Figure 5 illustrates these results for the full range of volume fractions with the same choice of constituents.

The results in Fig. 5 show very clearly that self-consistent values fall between the bounds as expected, and that the bounds themselves are in any case very close




FIG. 5: Comparison of the shear modulus estimates over all choices of volume fraction, for the same case considered in Figure 4.

together for this high contrast example. Thus, an exact result for shear modulus has not been found [so the analogy to Hill's formula (1) is not perfect]. Nevertheless, for most practical purposes, the results show that the predictions of the theory using such correlated bounds — and related self-consistent estimates — will often be as good as, or perhaps better than, the precision of experimental measurements. (Maximum error incurred by using the self-consistent estimate in the example of Figure 5 is about 2%.) The value of  $G_{\text{eff}}$ , while playing an important role in the analysis, clearly should not be interpreted as the actual value of the effective overall shear modulus for the random polycrystal.  $G_{\text{eff}}$  does however contribute about 20% of the overall magnitude of the effective shear modulus.

In conclusion, we note that, among other applications, analytical results as presented here can be used very effectively when benchmarking numerical procedures for estimating elastic behavior of complex composites.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Work performed by University of California, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract No. W-7405-ENG-48 and supported specifically by the Geosciences Research Program of the DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Biosciences.

## APPENDIX A: PESELNICK-MEISTER-WATT BOUNDS FOR HEXAGONAL SYMMETRY

Hashin-Shtrikman-style bounds [17, 18] on the bulk and shear moduli of isotropic random polycrystals composed of hexagonal grains have been derived by Peselnick

and Meister [12], with later corrections by Watt and Peselnick [13]. The main results are presented here using notation consistent with that of our text, in order to emphasize the connections to the analysis presented. To keep this summary brief, we will merely quote the results and refer the reader to the original papers for the derivations.

Parameters used to optimize the Hashin-Shtrikman bounds are  $K_{\pm}$  and  $G_{\pm}$ , which have the significance of being the bulk and shear moduli of two isotropic comparison materials.  $G_{+}, K_{+}$  are the values used in the formulas for the upper bounds, and  $G_{-}, K_{-}$  for the lower bounds. Formulas for the bounds are:

$$K_{PM}^{\pm} = K_{\pm} + \frac{K_V - K_{\pm}}{1 - 2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\text{eff}}^V - G_{\pm})}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\mu_{PM}^{\pm} = G_{\pm} + \frac{B_2^{\pm}}{1 + 2\beta_{\pm}B_2^{\pm}}, \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\pm} &= \frac{-1}{K_{\pm} + 4G_{\pm}/3}, \\ \beta_{\pm} &= \frac{2\alpha_{\pm}}{15} - \frac{1}{5G_{\pm}}, \\ \gamma_{\pm} &= \frac{1}{9}(\alpha_{\pm} - 3\beta_{\pm}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and

$$B_2^{\pm} = \frac{1}{5} \left[ \frac{G_{\text{eff}}^V - G_{\pm}}{\mathcal{D}_{\pm}} + \frac{2(c_{44} - G_{\pm})}{1 - 2\beta_{\pm}(c_{44} - G_{\pm})} + \frac{2(c_{66} - G_{\pm})}{1 - 2\beta_{\pm}(c_{66} - G_{\pm})} \right], \quad (20)$$

with

$$\mathcal{D}_{\pm} = 1 - \beta_{\pm}(c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{33} - 3K_{\pm} - 2G_{\pm}) - 9\gamma_{\pm}(K_V - K_{\pm}). \quad (21)$$

Optimum values of the moduli for the comparison materials have been shown to be (in our notation)

$$K_{-} = \frac{K_V(G_{\text{eff}}^R - G_{-})}{(G_{\text{eff}}^V - G_{-})} \quad (22)$$

with

$$0 \leq G_{-} \leq \min(c_{44}, G_{\text{eff}}^R, c_{66}), \quad (23)$$

and

$$K_{+} = \frac{K_V(G_{+} - G_{\text{eff}}^R)}{(G_{+} - G_{\text{eff}}^V)} \quad (24)$$

with

$$\max(c_{44}, G_{\text{eff}}^V, c_{66}) \leq G_{+} \leq \infty. \quad (25)$$

Note that, when  $G_{-} = 0$ ,  $K_{-} = K_R$ , because  $K_R = K_V G_{\text{eff}}^R / G_{\text{eff}}^V$  from the product formulas [1]. Also, note that, if  $K_n = K$  is constant, then  $K_{\pm} = K_V = K_R = K$  for any choice of  $G_{\pm}$ , since then we also have that  $G_{\text{eff}}^V = G_{\text{eff}}^R$ .

For the laminated materials considered here, the minimum condition in (23) will never be satisfied by  $c_{66}$  except in the trivial case of constant shear modulus. Each of the other two arguments can possibly become the minimum under certain nontrivial circumstances. For the materials considered here, it follows from (7) that the maximum condition in (25) will always be uniquely satisfied by  $c_{66}$ , except again for the trivial case of constant shear modulus.

Peselnick and Meister [12] had originally obtained all the results here except for the additional condition in (23) that permits  $c_{44}$  to be replaced in certain circumstances by  $G_{\text{eff}}^R$ . This new condition was added by Watt and Peselnick [13].

## APPENDIX B: BOUNDS OF DEDERICHS AND ZELLER FOR MULTIPHASE MEDIA

One of the bounds of Dederichs and Zeller [20] is based on the assumption that, inside each grain of a multiphase material, the distribution of different phases is independent of the shape of the grain, and also independent of the phases of contiguous grains. Grains are therefore assumed to be completely uncorrelated, both internally and externally. The results obtained for bulk modulus are:

$$K_{DZ}^{\pm} = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{K_n + 4g_{\pm}/3} \right]^{-1} - 4g_{\pm}/3, \quad (26)$$

where

$$g_- = c_{44} \quad \text{and} \quad g_+ = c_{66} \quad (27)$$

in our present notation [see eq. (7)]. Similarly, for shear modulus, we have

$$\mu_{DZ}^{\pm} = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{\mu_n + \zeta_{\pm}} \right]^{-1} - \zeta_{\pm}, \quad (28)$$

where

$$\zeta_- = \frac{c_{44}}{6} \frac{\langle 9/\mu + 8/K \rangle}{\langle 1/\mu + 2/K \rangle} = \frac{g_-}{6} \frac{9 \langle 1/K \rangle^{-1} + 8g_-}{\langle 1/K \rangle^{-1} + 2g_-} \quad (29)$$

and

$$\zeta_+ = \frac{c_{66}}{6} \frac{\langle 9K + 8\mu \rangle}{\langle K + 2\mu \rangle} = \frac{g_+}{6} \frac{9 \langle K \rangle + 8g_+}{\langle K \rangle + 2g_+}. \quad (30)$$

These bounds on bulk modulus are the same as those of Beran and Molyneux [22] and Miller [23]. The upper bound on shear modulus is the same as that of McCoy [24] and Silnutzer [25]. Because of the simple functional form of both sets of bounds, it is easy to show [21] that they are always at least as restrictive as — and, for nonnegligible volume fractions of inclusions, normally a significant improvement upon — the Hashin-Shtrikman bounds [17, 18].

We choose to consider these bounds here because they depend only on simple volume averages of the constituent elastic constants, and also because they show — by way of contrast to the other bounds (see Figures 1 and 2) — that it does indeed matter what assumptions are made about the microstructure of the composite.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. G. Berryman, *Geophys. J. Int.* **127**, 415 (2004).
- [2] R. Hill, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **11**, 357 (1963).
- [3] R. Hill, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **12**, 199 (1964).
- [4] G. W. Milton, *The Theory of Composites* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002).
- [5] E. O. Hall, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London B* **64**, 747 (1951).
- [6] N. J. Petch, *J. Iron Steel Inst.* **174**, 25 (1953).
- [7] J. Schiøtz, F. D. Di Tolla, and K. W. Jacobsen, *Nature* **391**, 561 (1998).
- [8] J. Bear, *Dynamics of Fluids in Porous Media* (Dover, New York, 1972).
- [9] T. Bourbié, O. Coussy, and B. Zinsner, *Acoustics of Porous Media* (Gulf Publishing Company, Houston, Texas, 1987).
- [10] W. J. Drugan and J. R. Willis, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **44**, 497 (1996).
- [11] J. G. Berryman, *Trans. ASME J. Energy Resources Tech.* **116**, 87 (1994).
- [12] L. Peselnick and R. Meister, *J. Appl. Phys.* **36**, 2879 (1965).
- [13] J. P. Watt and L. Peselnick, *J. Appl. Phys.* **51**, 1525 (1980).
- [14] G. E. Backus, *J. Geophys. Res.* **67**, 4427 (1962).
- [15] G. W. Postma, *Geophysics* **20**, 780 (1955).
- [16] R. Hill, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London A* **65**, 349 (1952).
- [17] Z. Hashin and S. Shtrikman, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **10**, 335 (1962).
- [18] Z. Hashin and S. Shtrikman, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **11**, 127 (1963).
- [19] G. W. Milton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 542 (1981).
- [20] P. H. Dederichs and R. Zeller, *Z. Physik* **259**, 103 (1973).
- [21] J. G. Berryman, in *Elastic Wave Scattering and Propagation*, edited by V. K. Varadan and V. V. Varadan (Ann Arbor Science, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1982), pp. 111–129.
- [22] M. J. Beran and J. Molyneux, *Quart. Appl. Math.* **24**, 107 (1966).
- [23] M. N. Miller, *J. Math. Phys.* **10**, 2005 (1969).
- [24] J. J. McCoy, in *Recent Advances in Engineering Science*, edited by A. C. Eringen (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1970), Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Society of Engineering Science, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, November 11–13, 1968, pp. 235–254.
- [25] N. R. Silnutzer, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania (1972).